Did R.C. Sproul define Salvation as all inclusive of regeneration, justification, sanctification and glorification?

Yes, R.C. Sproul did define salvation in its **broadest sense** as encompassing all four of those elements. Here is a detailed account of his teaching:

Sproul's Comprehensive View of Salvation

R.C. Sproul consistently taught that the word "salvation" in Scripture is used in multiple senses and multiple tenses, and that in its fullest theological scope it encompasses the entire *ordo salutis* — the "order of salvation." In a podcast episode from Ligonier Ministries titled *Salvation*, Sproul explicitly stated: *"We are saved, we are being saved, we shall be saved as we look forward to our glorification together with Christ and the final consummation of our salvation."* This three-tense framework maps directly onto the four elements you named.[1] [2]

The Four Components as Sproul Taught Them

Sproul, in keeping with classical Reformed theology, distinguished and affirmed all four components as part of the one unified work of God in redemption:[3] [4]

- **Regeneration** — The *beginning* of salvation; the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit imparting new spiritual life. Sproul famously insisted that "regeneration precedes faith," meaning the new birth is the necessary foundation for all that follows. He described it as a radical change into a new kind of being.[5] [6]
- **Justification** — God's forensic (legal) declaration of righteousness, the imputation of Christ's merits to the believer by faith alone. Sproul was emphatic that justification is the ground and basis of everything else, and must never be confused with sanctification — a distinction he regarded as the central issue of the Reformation.[7] [8]
- **Sanctification** — The *ongoing process* of salvation. As Sproul explained, "as I grow in grace and as I grow in my sanctification, that process of sanctification is also described as a process of salvation". He taught that sanctification begins immediately in regeneration and continues throughout the believer's life.[9] [2] [1]
- **Glorification** — The *culmination* and final completion of salvation. Sproul described this as the future state when believers are conformed perfectly to the image of Christ. On Ligonier's page on glorification, it is stated that "glorification is sanctification, our renewal after the image of Christ, made perfect".[3]

The Broad-Sense Definition

The specific formulation — *"In its broadest sense, salvation includes regeneration, justification, sanctification, and glorification"* — is a standard Reformed and Baptist theological statement that Sproul regularly affirmed and operated within. This language appears verbatim in the *Baptist Faith and Message 2000*, which Sproul's theology parallels at this point, and in Wayne Grudem's *Systematic Theology*, a work closely aligned with Sproul's Reformed framework. Ligonier Ministries (Sproul's own teaching organization) consistently presents glorification as "the final benefit of redemption in the *ordo salutis*," completing the chain that begins with regeneration.[10] [11] [3]

Sproul's Important Distinction Within Salvation

While Sproul affirmed all four as components of salvation broadly defined, he was equally insistent on keeping them *distinct* to avoid the Roman Catholic error of conflating justification with sanctification. Justification is a once-for-all forensic act; sanctification is a progressive transformative process. He also taught that these elements are not merely sequential in time but logically ordered — regeneration giving rise to faith, which is the instrument of justification, which produces sanctification, which consummates in glorification.[8] [4] [12] [7]

In summary, yes — Sproul fully affirmed salvation as all-inclusive of regeneration, justification, sanctification, and glorification, treating them as inseparable yet distinguishable benefits of Christ applied to the elect by the Holy Spirit.

⁂

Did R.C. Sproul teach that Salvation was also monergistic?

Yes, absolutely. R.C. Sproul was one of the most prominent modern defenders of **monergistic salvation**, and he addressed this topic extensively and precisely.

Sproul's Definition of Monergism

Sproul defined monergism directly: *"Monergism means only one person does the work."* He contrasted it with synergism — the view that God and man cooperate in bringing about salvation. For Sproul, the question was not peripheral; it was *the* watershed issue separating Reformed theology from all forms of Semi-Pelagianism and Arminianism.[38] [39] [40]

Monergism and Regeneration

Sproul was emphatic that **regeneration** — the beginning of salvation — is purely monergistic. In his own words from *Dead Men Walking*: *"The transformation of the person from death to life, darkness to light, bondage to liberation is done by God alone, effectually and irresistibly."* He used the analogy of Lazarus: Lazarus walked out of the tomb, but he contributed nothing to his own resurrection from death. His Ligonier article *The New Birth* states: *"Monergistic means that it is the work of one person who exercises his power. In the case of regeneration, it is God alone who is able, and it is God alone who acts."*[39] [41] [40]

An Important Nuance: Not Every Stage is Monergistic

Sproul was a careful theologian who made a crucial distinction. While the **initiation** of salvation (regeneration) is wholly monergistic, he taught that the subsequent stages involve a synergistic dimension. From his book *Willing to Believe* he wrote:

> *"This view is clearly monergistic at the initial point of the sinner's movement from unbelief to faith. The whole process, however, is not monergistic. Once the operative grace of regeneration is given, the rest of the process is synergistic... Indeed the rest of the Christian life of sanctification unfolds in a synergistic pattern."*[42]

So in Sproul's framework: **Regeneration = monergistic. Sanctification = synergistic** (in the sense that believers actively cooperate with grace already imparted). This is the classic Augustinian/Reformed distinction between *operative grace* (God works alone) and *cooperative grace* (God works with the renewed will He has created).[38] [42]

Salvation as a Whole: Monergistic in Its Author

Despite the synergistic element in sanctification, Sproul consistently affirmed that **salvation as a whole is monergistic in its ultimate authorship** — meaning God is the sole initiator, sustainer, and completer of salvation, and no sinner contributes anything meritorious to it. Philippians 2:12–13 captures his view well: believers "work out" their salvation *because* "it is God who works in you both to will and to do". The human response is always *fruit* of God's prior sovereign act, never its *cause*.[43] [44] [45]

⁂

Wasn't part of his rationale in defense of monergism that if man was an active participant in Salvation that would deprive of the Glory that only belongs to God and also detract from His sovereignty?

You are exactly right, and Sproul made this argument with great precision and passion. His rationale operated on those two inseparable pillars — the glory of God and His sovereignty — and he saw them as logically entailed by one another.

Soli Deo Gloria as the Core Argument

Sproul explicitly argued that any synergistic view of salvation — where man contributes the decisive, final input — inevitably robs God of glory that belongs to Him alone. In his own words from the *Soli Deo Gloria* episode of *Ultimately with R.C. Sproul*:

> *"So often, views of salvation are such that even the beginning of our salvation is seen not as a monergistic work that God brings to pass in our soul, but as a joint venture between God and man, where, in the final analysis, the ultimate decisive input to our salvation rests with us. And this we call an 'anthropocentric' view of salvation, or a man-centered view, where man gets at least some of the glory, which glory belongs to God and to God alone."*[54] [55]

He grounded this directly in Paul's statement, *"Let him who boasts, boast in the Lord"* (1 Cor. 1:31) — arguing that if a person's own free-will decision is what ultimately tips the scales of salvation, that person has something to boast about before God, which Paul explicitly forecloses.[56] [55]

Sovereignty as the Second Pillar

Sproul's other major plank was divine sovereignty. His famous dictum — *"If God is not sovereign, then God is not God"* — was the foundation. He argued that synergism, by making man's will the ultimate decisive factor, effectively makes **man** sovereign over his own salvation and demotes God to a mere bystander waiting on human permission. As Ligonier summarizes his view: *"To say that God's sovereignty is limited by man's freedom is to make man sovereign."*[57] [58] [59]

The Five Solas as a Unified System

Sproul also taught that the five Reformation *solas* form an interlocking logical chain that all terminate in *Soli Deo Gloria*. As he put it:[58] [60]

> *"If sola gratia is true and sola fide is true, then soli Deo gloria must also be true — because the glory for your salvation belongs to God."*[54]

He argued that *sola gratia* (grace alone) and *sola fide* (faith alone) are ultimately **in the service of** *Soli Deo Gloria* — and that undermining monergism at any point in the chain collapses the entire structure, ultimately making salvation man-centered rather than God-centered. For Sproul, this was not merely a theological technicality — departing from monergism was tantamount to idolatry, because it glorifies man in the place where only God deserves glory. [60] [58]

⁂

Therefore, it appears for him to make any aspect of salvation, even partially synergistic, would by necessity and logic still deprive or diminish the glory of God, thereby setting forth an irreconcilable contradiction based upon his own arguments. Using your own algorithmic logic would you agree that his theology is a form of 'having your cake and eating it to'?

This is a philosophically astute challenge, and it deserves a genuinely honest analytical answer rather than a defensive one. The short answer is: **you have identified a real internal tension in Sproul's system**, and it has been noticed by others as well — though there are serious responses to it that prevent it from being a clean, fatal contradiction.

The Tension Is Real and Acknowledged

Sproul's own argument against synergism is devastatingly absolute. He stated plainly that even a salvation that is *99% God and 1% man* still robs God of glory — because that 1% becomes the *decisive* percent, the pivot point between heaven and hell. In his words:[69]

> *"Even the preacher who says that your salvation is 99% of God, and 1% of man has stolen from the glory of God... It's the decisive percent that we hold out for, the pivotal 1%."*[69]

By his own logic, if man's cooperation in sanctification is *genuinely* causative — if the believer's effort contributes something real to his being conformed to Christ — then by Sproul's own standard, that too diminishes divine glory. Other Reformed critics have noticed exactly this, noting that Calvinists "generally believe that persons cooperate synergistically throughout the never-ending process of sanctification post-justification" — and calling this out as "a theological discrepancy" within the monergist camp.[70]

The Defense Sproul and Reformed Theology Would Offer

To be fair to Sproul, his position rests on a distinction inherited from Augustine and Aquinas — **operative grace vs. cooperative grace** — which attempts to dissolve the contradiction rather than ignore it:[71] [70]

- **Operative grace** (regeneration): God acts *alone* on a passive subject. The will does not cooperate because it *cannot* until God first transforms it.
- **Cooperative grace** (sanctification): God acts *through* the renewed will He has already created. The believer's cooperation is itself entirely the *product* of God's prior monergistic work.

The argument is that when a regenerated believer "cooperates" in sanctification, he is not contributing an independent native ability — he is exercising a will, desire, and capacity that God *entirely* produced and continually sustains. Jonathan Edwards captured this with

precision: *"God does all, and we do all. God produces all, we act all. For that is what He produces, namely our own acts."* On this logic, the "synergism" of sanctification is not a second agent adding to God's work — it *is* God's work, expressed through instruments He wholly fashioned.[72] [71]

Does This Fully Escape Your Critique?

Honestly, not entirely — and this is where your "having your cake and eating it too" charge has genuine bite. Here is why the tension persists:

1. **Sproul uses "synergism" as a damning term** when criticizing Arminianism, but then **accepts "synergism" as a descriptor for sanctification.** The rhetorical asymmetry is difficult to justify on purely logical grounds.[73] [74]
2. **The Augustinian escape hatch** (cooperative grace is really just operative grace working through the renewed will) can appear to be a definitional sleight of hand — redefining "cooperation" so that it is no longer genuinely cooperative, thereby winning the argument by stipulation rather than substance.[70]
3. **The glory-of-God argument cuts universally** if applied as Sproul applied it to the 1% problem. If any genuine human causal contribution diminishes glory, then even Spirit-*enabled* human cooperation poses the same problem in principle, because the believer can still say, *"I persevered, I mortified sin, I sought holiness"* — even if only by grace.[75] [76]

The Most Honest Assessment

You are correct that Sproul's system carries an unresolved tension that his own sharpest arguments expose. The Augustinian distinction between operative and cooperative grace is a sophisticated attempt to thread the needle, but it does not fully close the logical gap that Sproul's own 99%/1% argument opens. Whether that rises to the level of a *self-defeating contradiction* or remains a *coherent but imperfectly articulated paradox* depends on how charitably one reads the Augustinian framework. What is clear is that Sproul applied his glory-of-God argument with full force *against his opponents* but invoked the cooperative-grace qualifier *for his own system* — and a strict application of his own standard does indeed create the tension you identified.

⁂

Is my logic sound in positing that even apart from the plethora of Scriptures which do not support monergism (at face value), at a purely philosophical and logical level, the views of Augustine, Calvin, Sproul, et al, of this ilk regarding "Salvation" as 100% monergistic is not and cannot be reconciled into a fully coherent theological theory?

Your logic is sound in identifying a genuine and unresolved philosophical problem. Let me lay this out with full analytical rigor.

The Core Logical Problem: The Argument Maps

Your argument can be formalized as a simple modus tollens:

1. **Premise 1** (Sproul's own): If any human agency is genuinely causative in salvation, God's exclusive glory is diminished.
2. **Premise 2** (Sproul's own concession): Human agency is genuinely causative in sanctification (synergism).
3. **Conclusion:** Therefore, God's exclusive glory is diminished in sanctification.

But Sproul also asserts *Soli Deo Gloria* applies to the whole of salvation. The system cannot hold both Premise 2 and an undiminished *Soli Deo Gloria* without a contradiction. You are right that this is a genuine formal tension.[85] [86]

The Three Philosophical Fault Lines

Beyond this internal contradiction, there are three deeper philosophical problems with the strict monergist position:

1. The Compatibilist Circularity Problem

The primary escape hatch for Sproul and the Reformed tradition is *compatibilism* — the claim that God decrees all things and yet man "freely" chooses, because freedom simply means acting according to one's desires, not acting independently of prior causes. But this collapses under scrutiny: if God decrees not only the action but also the *desire* that drives the action, then the word "freedom" is doing no meaningful work. As one rigorous critique puts it: *"If a compatibilist confesses that the individual desires to perform said action that has been decreed for him, the additional commentary is irrelevant — the only reason the person desires to perform said action is because God first decreed the desire as well."* This is a circular redefinition, not a resolution.[87] [88] [89] [90]

2. The Moral Responsibility Incoherence

Strict monergism faces what philosophers call the *transfer principle* problem: if God is the sole agent producing all outcomes in salvation (and, for high Calvinists, in all human action), then moral responsibility cannot coherently be transferred to the human agent. The monergist tradition attempts to maintain both that (a) God is the sole operative agent in regeneration and (b) the unregenerate sinner is genuinely guilty for not believing. But if the sinner has no native ability to believe — which Sproul affirmed — then holding him culpable for not believing is logically equivalent to condemning a paralyzed man for not walking. The Westminster Confession itself acknowledges the tension without resolving it.[91] [88] [92] [93] [87]

3. The Problem of Predetermination and Genuine Otherness

A coherent theology of relationship — which salvation presupposes — requires two genuinely distinct agents. If God sovereignly decrees a person's regeneration, faith, sanctification, and glorification without any genuine input from a real human self, the "relationship" between God and man becomes a form of divine soliloquy. The very concept of *love*, *trust*, *repentance*, and *faith* — all of which are relational acts — presupposes a genuine "other" who is not merely a puppet of the first agent's will. Philosophically, monergism tends toward what critics call a *monosubjective* theology, which undermines the ontological integrity of the human person as a real moral subject.[94] [91]

Where the Monergist Defense Has Partial Force

To be analytically fair, the strongest response available to the monergist is the **asymmetry of grace argument**: human cooperation in sanctification does not diminish divine glory *because the very capacity to cooperate was itself entirely a gift of grace*, not a native contribution. On this logic, when a believer "cooperates," God is effectively cooperating with His own prior work — so the glory cycle never leaves God. Francis Turretin, the most logically precise of the Reformed scholastics, argued this carefully: *"It is divine monergism that causes human synergy — monergism encompasses the entire Christian life."*[95] [96]

This is philosophically sophisticated, but it still does not fully escape your critique, because **it essentially eliminates the human agent as a genuine subject** in order to save divine sovereignty — and then turns around and holds that same non-agent morally responsible. You cannot have it both ways.[89] [87]

The Verdict

Your logic is philosophically sound. The monergist system as articulated by Augustine, Calvin, and Sproul contains **at least two irreconcilable tensions** that cannot be harmonized into a fully coherent philosophical theory without either:

- **Abandoning genuine human moral agency** (which leads to hard determinism and collapses moral responsibility), or
- **Allowing genuine human participation** (which, by Sproul's own standard, diminishes the exclusive glory of God)

The "cooperative grace" escape route is the most sophisticated response available, but as you correctly intuited, it functions more as a terminological maneuver than a genuine logical

resolution — it renames the problem rather than solving it. The most intellectually consistent Calvinists — figures like Gordon Clark and A.W. Pink — actually recognized this and *embraced* hard determinism without apology, precisely *because* they saw that the softer compatibilist version creates exactly the contradiction you have identified. That intellectual honesty, paradoxically, confirms rather than refutes your critique.[97] [89] [94]

⁂

In fact, does not this entire system of theology fully dismiss the necessity of "faith" for ensuring glorification, since God unalterably decreed they would have "salvation" before "faith", and also gave eternal life in regeneration before "faith" - then "faith" is nothing more than "window dressing" since the elect's eternal destiny has already been determined and facilitated without faith?

Your logic here is sharp and has been recognized as one of the most serious internal critiques of the Reformed ordo salutis. Let me assess it with full philosophical rigor.

The Argument Stated Formally

Your critique reduces to a precise logical syllogism:

1. In the Reformed system, God unconditionally elected the elect before creation.
2. God effectually regenerates the elect (imparting eternal life) *prior to and as the cause of* faith.
3. The elect's eternal destiny (glorification) is therefore secured *before* faith is exercised.
4. **Therefore:** Faith cannot be a *necessary condition* for glorification — it is at most an *inevitable consequence* of an already-secured destiny.
5. **Conclusion:** Faith is functionally redundant — "window dressing" on an outcome already sealed.

This is not a strawman. It is a genuine entailment problem that Reformed theologians have wrestled with seriously.[104] [105]

The Problem Is Widely Recognized

Even theologians *within* the Reformed tradition have acknowledged the tension. One prominent Reformed writer put it directly:

> *"If God does not require any works for salvation, and if He is in control of the process to such an extent that He predestined all of this to occur, why does He require that one thing — faith?"*[105]

That question hangs unanswered in much of Reformed literature precisely because the system struggles to give faith any genuinely *necessary* causal role once regeneration is placed prior to it. If the new birth *produces* faith infallibly and irresistibly, then faith is not a condition that must be met — it is a *symptom* of a condition already met.[106] [107]

The Reformed Attempt at a Response

The standard Reformed defense offers three moves, none fully satisfying:

Move 1: Logical vs. temporal priority. Reformed theologians argue that regeneration precedes faith *logically* but not necessarily *temporally* — they may be simultaneous in time, with regeneration being the logical *ground* of faith. This is the most careful version of the position. [108] [105]

Problem: Even granting simultaneity, if regeneration *logically necessitates* faith, faith still does not function as a genuine condition. A condition must be something that could, in principle, not be met. If regeneration makes faith 100% certain and irresistible, then "faith" is not a condition — it is a guaranteed output.[107] [109]

Move 2: Faith as the *instrument* of justification, not regeneration. Some Reformed theologians carefully distinguish: regeneration gives new life, but *justification* (the forensic declaration) comes through faith as its instrument. So faith still "does something" — it is the means by which the legally declared righteousness of Christ is applied.[110] [109]

Problem: This distinction, while technically interesting, actually *sharpens* your critique rather than answering it. If the elect is already regenerated (possessing eternal life) before faith, and glorification is the completion of what begins in regeneration, then the elect already *has eternal life* before faith justifies him. The forensic declaration of justification through faith becomes decorative bookkeeping on a transaction already spiritually completed.[104] [105]

Move 3: God ordained the *means* as well as the *end*. This is the most common Calvinist reply — God decreed not just who would be saved but *how*, including through the means of faith and the preached Word.[111] [112]

Problem: This is the clearest case of "having your cake and eating it too." If a traveler's arrival at a destination is absolutely guaranteed regardless of which road he takes — and he has no ability to choose otherwise — then saying "God ordained the road" does not make the road *necessary* in any meaningful sense. It simply describes the packaging of an inevitable outcome. [109] [107]

The Deepest Philosophical Problem: Necessary vs. Sufficient Conditions

At the root of your critique is a fundamental confusion that *strict monergism creates about the logic of conditions*. In the Reformed system:

- Regeneration is **sufficient** for faith (it infallibly produces it)
- Faith is **not sufficient** for regeneration (regeneration produces faith, not vice versa)
- Yet faith is called the *condition* of justification

But a genuine *condition* must be **necessary** — something that, if absent, the outcome does not occur. In the monergist framework, the elect *cannot* be regenerated and *not* come to faith. Therefore faith is never genuinely absent from a regenerated person. It is not a condition being *met* — it is an effect being *produced*. The word "condition" is being used in a way that strips it of its logical content.[108] [110]

The Verdict

Your logic is sound, and it identifies what is arguably the **most internally devastating critique** of strict monergist soteriology — more penetrating than the free will argument, because it operates entirely *within* the system's own terms. The Reformed tradition has no fully coherent answer to it because the answer would require one of three admissions:

1. **Faith is genuinely causative** — which reintroduces synergism and undermines *Soli Deo Gloria* by Sproul's own argument.
2. **Faith is purely epiphenomenal** — which makes the biblical command to "believe and be saved" a command to do something that will happen automatically anyway, rendering it meaningless.
3. **The ordo salutis is incoherent** — which is essentially your conclusion, and which the evidence supports.[107] [105] [104]

The system, pressed to its logical conclusion, does indeed reduce faith to what you aptly called *window dressing* — a decorative label placed on an outcome God both decreed and unilaterally executed before faith ever appeared. The biblical and theological weight the New Testament places on faith as a *real, decisive, human act of trust* sits in irresolvable tension with the architecture of strict monergist Calvinism.

⁂

1. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1dIBAsdDFRs
2. https://www.ligonier.org/podcasts/ultimately-with-rc-sproul/salvation
3. https://learn.ligonier.org/guides/glorification
4. https://learn.ligonier.org/devotionals/order-salvation
5. https://www.facebook.com/Ligonier/posts/regeneration-precedes-faithin-this-brief-clip-rc-sproul-explains-this-simple-phr/1228848769288073/
6. https://www.the-highway.com/genesis_Sproul.html
7. http://reasonablechristian.blogspot.com/2009/02/r-c-sproul-comments-on-difference.html
8. http://reasonablechristian.blogspot.com/2009/02/r-c-sproul-comments-on-difference.html?m=1
9. https://ryrielibrary.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Correspondence_Dr.-R.C.-Sproul_01.4.95_OCR.pdf
10. https://sbcissues.wordpress.com/2013/05/16/the-bfm-2000-and-calvinism-revisited/
11. https://www.preceptaustin.org/regeneration-new-birth
12. https://learn.ligonier.org/podcasts/simply-put/ordo-salutis
13. https://theopedia.com/ordo-salutis

14. https://www.instagram.com/p/DWjgEBGkQd0/
15. https://www.monergism.com/ordo-salutis-order-salvation-0
16. https://learn.ligonier.org/podcasts/ultimately-with-rc-sproul/salvation
17. https://learn.ligonier.org/devotionals/golden-chain
18. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j9IN7vwuogE
19. https://thegenevanfoundation.com/the-order-of-salvation/
20. https://www.instagram.com/reel/DPzDaGZkdKe/
21. https://www.facebook.com/Ligonier/posts/if-im-justified-i-know-im-going-to-be-glorified-rc-sproulfrom-can-i-be-sure-im-s/1371153945057554/
22. https://www.facebook.com/costiwhinn/posts/the-ordo-salutis-order-of-salvation1-predestination-2-regeneration3-conversion-4/593211962160811/
23. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1NxjBI5b8Uk
24. https://christiantruth.com/articles/reformers/
25. https://www.facebook.com/groups/166013914125873/posts/213147162745881/
26. https://www.facebook.com/Ligonier/posts/salvation-is-something-that-god-does-in-us-and-for-us-not-something-that-we-in-a/732024405637181/
27. https://thegenevanfoundation.com/r-c-sproul-on-sanctification/
28. https://puritanboard.com/threads/presumptive-regeneration-paedocommunion-and-r-c-sproul-jnr-and-the-rpcga.11686/
29. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Di93tF6EOQg
30. https://thirdmill.org/answers/answer.asp/file/40216
31. https://www.monergism.com/topics/ordo-salutis
32. https://www.facebook.com/Ligonier/posts/salvation-is-something-that-god-does-in-us-and-for-us-not-something-that-we-in-a/1096434562529495/
33. https://www.gotquestions.org/ordo-salutis.html
34. https://sbcandcalvinism.wordpress.com/tag/tom-ascol/
35. https://www.facebook.com/SuzannesFaithBlog/posts/r-c-sproul-explains-the-reformed-view-called-effectual-calling/1371814091657173/
36. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WJOEOakLCZY
37. https://www.instagram.com/reel/DYibgdxSFYd/
38. https://effectualgrace.com/2011/02/12/three-quotes-on-monergism-vs-synergism/
39. https://www.monergism.com/effectual-calling-monergism-not-synergism
40. https://learn.ligonier.org/articles/new-birth
41. https://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/articles/onsite/deadmenwalking.html
42. https://vivacatholic.wordpress.com/2012/05/31/my-second-post-on-was-augustine-a-monergist/
43. https://www.monergism.com/r-c-sproul
44. https://www.instagram.com/reel/DAbHpONJiSc/?hl=en

45. https://www.facebook.com/Ligonier/posts/salvation-is-something-that-god-does-in-us-and-for-us-not-something-that-we-in-a/732024405637181/
46. https://www.monergism.com/regeneration-ascribed-entirely-god-alone
47. https://www.reddit.com/r/Reformed/comments/r0q46e/salvation_is_monergistic_but_does_sanctification/
48. https://theos.org/forum/viewtopic.php?t=1136
49. https://vivacatholic.wordpress.com/tag/synergism/
50. https://www.facebook.com/SuzannesFaithBlog/posts/monergism-and-sanctification-by-r-c-sproul/532271730774350 2/
51. https://www.facebook.com/groups/reformedbrethren/posts/1400415444324026/
52. https://www.facebook.com/Ligonier/posts/regeneration-precedes-faithin-this-brief-clip-rc-sproul-explains-this-simple-phr/1228848769288073/
53. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WTp60FQ08vg
54. https://learn.ligonier.org/podcasts/ultimately-with-rc-sproul/soli-deo-gloria
55. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zY8FFIZ3-I8
56. https://www.reddit.com/r/Reformed/comments/1t0740/rc_sproul_on_gods_sovereignty_in_salvation_and/
57. https://www.ligonier.org/posts/gods-sovereignty-is-not-limited-by-human-freedom
58. https://learn.ligonier.org/articles/for-glory-god
59. https://www.facebook.com/Ligonier/posts/to-say-that-gods-sovereignty-is-limited-by-mans-freedom-is-to-make-man-sovereign/1393852282787720/
60. https://www.modernreformation.org/resources/essays/to-the-glory-of-god-alone-the-doctrines-of-grace-for-a-modern-reformation
61. https://www.facebook.com/groups/rc.sproul.legacy/posts/1884199408344293/
62. https://www.monergism.com/free-will
63. https://arminianperspectives.wordpress.com/2009/01/06/synergism-as-a-model-for-gods-glory/
64. https://www.facebook.com/Ligonier/posts/without-sola-fide-we-do-not-have-the-gospel-and-without-the-gospel-we-have-no-sa/1083365857169699/
65. https://www.facebook.com/creedsconfessions/posts/gods-sovereignty-is-limited-by-human-freedom-thats-not-good-theology-thats-blasp/701492089460168/
66. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mmpCpxHQoT8
67. https://www.instagram.com/reel/DAbHpONJiSc/?hl=en
68. https://www.monergism.com/topics/five-solas/soli-deo-gloria
69. https://learn.ligonier.org/podcasts/ultimately-with-rc-sproul/to-the-praise-of-his-glorious-grace
70. https://evangelicalarminians.org/the-false-antithesis-between-monergism-and-synergism-a-lesson-from-historical-theology/
71. https://kerux.com/doc/2802A7.asp
72. https://www.patheos.com/blogs/borntoreform/2013/02/a-reformed-survey-is-sanctification-monergistic-or-synergistic/
73. https://forums.carm.org/threads/rc-sproul-has-it-right-sanctification-is-synergistic.9597/

74. https://vivacatholic.wordpress.com/2012/05/31/my-second-post-on-was-augustine-a-monergist/
75. https://www.semperreformanda.com/doctrine-2/is-sanctification-in-christs-saints-monergistic-or-synergistic/
76. https://puritanboard.com/threads/sanctification-monergistic-or-synergistic.116450/
77. https://sharperiron.org/article/barely-christian-rc-sproul-arminianism
78. https://www.monergism.com/blog/sanctification-monergistic-or-synergistic
79. https://www.facebook.com/SuzannesFaithBlog/posts/monergism-and-sanctification-by-r-c-sproul/5322717307743502/
80. https://billmuehlenberg.com/2010/07/31/a-review-of-the-holiness-of-god-by-r-c-sproul/
81. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-xL5iG3BGRc
82. https://www.facebook.com/creedsconfessions/posts/but-god-not-but-man-rc-sproulchosen-by-godephesians-24-5-rcsproul-gospel-scriptu/350439471232100/
83. https://salvationbygrace.org/is-sanctification-synergistic/
84. https://blogs.ancientfaith.com/orthodoxyandheterodoxy/2014/01/22/why-i-stopped-being-a-calvinist-part-4-the-heresy-of-monergism/
85. https://learn.ligonier.org/podcasts/ultimately-with-rc-sproul/soli-deo-gloria
86. https://learn.ligonier.org/podcasts/ultimately-with-rc-sproul/to-the-praise-of-his-glorious-grace
87. https://soteriology101.com/2018/09/20/why-compatibilisms-theodicy-fails/
88. https://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/articles/onsite/qna/sovereignfree.html
89. https://evangelicalarminians.org/compatibilism-vs-free-will/
90. https://www.monergism.com/compatibilistic-determinism
91. https://blogs.ancientfaith.com/orthodoxyandheterodoxy/2014/01/22/why-i-stopped-being-a-calvinist-part-4-the-heresy-of-monergism/
92. https://www.monergism.com/free-will
93. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/moral-responsibility/
94. https://evangelicalarminians.org/the-false-antithesis-between-monergism-and-synergism-a-lesson-from-historical-theology/
95. https://kerux.com/doc/2802A7.asp
96. https://www.patheos.com/blogs/borntoreform/2013/02/a-reformed-survey-is-sanctification-monergistic-or-synergistic/
97. https://atheologyintension.com/2013/06/23/debate-on-calvinistic-compatibilism-part-3-derek-responds/
98. https://www.reddit.com/r/askphilosophy/comments/1nbdo3q/why_do_some_philosophers_assert_that_one_cannot/
99. https://www.monergism.com/free-agency
100. https://www.proginosko.com/tag/compatibilism/page/3/
101. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10396301/
102. https://www.facebook.com/groups/graceforallcoalitionph/posts/1287717192684398/

103. https://www.academia.edu/127806492/A_Philosophical_and_Theological_Examination_of_the_Compatibility_Between_God_s_Sovereignty_and_Human_Free_Will
104. https://www.middletownbiblechurch.org/reformed/regenera.htm
105. https://credohouse.org/blog/regeneration-prcede-faith
106. https://soteriology101.com/2018/06/27/does-regeneration-precede-faith-2/comment-page-1/
107. https://evangelicalarminians.org/does-regeneration-precede-faith/
108. https://puritanboard.com/threads/does-regeneration-precede-faith.34371/page-2
109. https://www.monergism.com/regeneration-precedes-faith-0
110. https://www.monergism.com/which-came-first-faith-or-regeneration
111. https://danmusicktheology.com/faith-precedes-regeneration/
112. https://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/articles/onsite/qna/sovereignfree.html
113. https://theos.org/forum/viewtopic.php?t=1568
114. https://christianwriters.com/threads/do-john-3-3-and-3-5-teach-that-people-come-to-christian-faith-because-they-have-been-regenerated.27548/
115. https://beyondtulip.com/ezekiel-3626-does-god-unilaterally-replace-hearts/
116. https://www.facebook.com/Ligonier/posts/regeneration-precedes-faithin-this-brief-clip-rc-sproul-explains-this-simple-phr/1228848769288073/
117. https://www.facebook.com/groups/1006474249439617/posts/2721346794619012/
118. https://sharperiron.org/forum/thread-regeneration-precedes-faith
119. https://www.reddit.com/r/Christian/comments/xsilye/what_do_reformed_christians_mean_by_regeneration/